Workplace incivility and its impact on job performance among employees in Jordanian public universities

Abdelsalam Fahad AL-Awamrah[1]

Razane Chroqui[2+]

[1]Faculty of Educational Sciences, the University of Jordan, Jordan.
Email: A.Awamrah@ju.edu.jo
[2]Hassan First University of Settat, National School of Applied Sciences, Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Applied Sciences, Morocco.
Email: chroqui.razane@uhp.ac.ma

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Workplace incivility presents a challenge to the job performance of employees, including those in public universities. This form of mistreatment can lead to cognitive distraction and reduced work efforts among employees, ultimately contributing to a decline in organizational productivity. The current study aims at measuring the impact of workplace incivility on the job performance of personnel in public universities, considering incivility linked to the workplace itself on the one hand, and to the employees on the other. The study employed a descriptive-analytical survey approach and used a questionnaire to examine the forms of incivility that employees experienced and their effects. The findings revealed that, according to the analyzed occurrence rates, 71% of employees reported experiencing incivility in the workplace over the past five years, sometimes coinciding with harassment incidents. More specifically, 39% of employees encountered incivility once or twice, 25% faced verbal harassment, and 6% endured frequent incivility. This behavior was described separately from sexual harassment; the remaining analyses concentrated on this latter subgroup of employees. The study recommended creating a supportive work environment for employees by adopting motivational measures, such as financial and moral incentives and promotions, which positively impact employees and their performance levels.

Contribution/Originality: The originality of the study lies in expanding the scope of incivility to include subtle forms beyond physical abuse and in comprehensively investigating multiple outcome categories: psychological, physical, and job-related. Furthermore, the study incorporates social power variables and distinguishes between work-related and person-related incivility, finding that work-related incivility has a more significant impact.

1. INTRODUCTION

Human beings constitute the core of human capital, serving as a vital resource in production and a key driver of universities' progress. Given the extensive knowledge employees possess, institutions cannot achieve a competitive advantage without a competent and qualified human element (Wright, McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). Thus, universities and their administrations must dedicate considerable attention to their workforce by ensuring courtesy, tact, and politeness, and by providing for all their needs (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Nevertheless, Empirical research indicates that higher education institutions are not exempt from interpersonal mistreatment, including incivility, bullying, and abusive supervision, often enacted within hierarchical and power-structured environments (Bentley et al., 2012; Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Such behaviors, particularly when originating from individuals in supervisory or administrative positions, have been shown to undermine

employee well-being and significantly impair job performance (Porath & Erez, 2007; Tepper, 2000). Indeed, workplace incivility has emerged as a significant issue in numerous universities worldwide, including those in developing countries, irrespective of their size or sector (Baker, 2000).

Workplace incivility is not limited to negative behaviors by superiors toward their subordinates, such as failing to provide a safe and stable work environment, or negative interactions among employees themselves. These behaviors can manifest at all levels, from the university president to department heads, and can include threats, harassment, or repeated abuse (Schilpzand, De Pater, & Erez, 2016). Workplace incivility is somewhat broader than interactive injustice, which refers explicitly to unfairness or insensitivity encountered while implementing organizational procedures and policies. While interactive injustice typically focuses on mistreatment by individuals in authority, incivility can push employees away at any level of the organizational structure. It can also emanate from a variety of sources, including those in leadership positions or peers within universities, wherein ignorance or insensitivity is displayed during the enactment of organizational policies and procedures (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

The accumulation of a series of low-level confrontations can lead to a "tipping point," where a final minor injustice triggers severe retaliatory aggression. Bies (2001) proposed a model of perceived injustice that generates "interpersonal heat," ultimately culminating in violent outbursts. Consequently, relatively minor forms of interpersonal incivility can, over time, escalate into major organizational conflict. The theoretical "snowball effect" of incivility aligns with broader perspectives on stress and coping with everyday challenges (Shi et al., 2018).

This study explores the relationship between workplace incivility and employees' job performance at Jordanian public universities. The research focuses explicitly on incivility linked to the workplace itself (work-related incivility) and to the employees (person-related incivility). It builds on previous research by analyzing incidence rates, targets, and effects on a large sample of employees in Jordanian public universities, accounting for social power variables likely to influence workplace incivility and mistreatment. It sampled 300 administrative employees from four specific public universities in central Jordan: University of Jordan (UJ), German-Jordanian University (GJU), Al-Balqa Applied University (BAU), and Hashemite University (HU). They have a presidential system with varying degrees of decentralization, reflecting both national governance culture and institutional autonomy. They vary in terms of their orientation toward tradition, modernity, and internationalism. UJ seems to exemplify a conservative academic culture rooted in hierarchy and seniority. BAU emphasizes regional service, vocational pragmatism, and collective identity. HU positions itself as a modernizing force, embracing innovation and inclusivity, particularly through ICT integration. GJU stands apart with a distinctly globalized and professional ethos, fostering a workplace culture that values teamwork, accountability, and cross-cultural competencies.

This current study addresses the following research question: What is the effect of workplace incivility on employees' job performance in public universities? It is organized into four key sections: the first section establishes the conceptual foundation through a review of relevant literature, introducing key terms, theoretical frameworks, and prior research on incivility and job performance. The second section describes the research methodology and steps taken to ensure validity and reliability. The third section presents the findings in light of the study's guiding questions and hypotheses. Finally, the concluding section synthesizes the main results and highlights practical implications.

2. STATE OF THE ART

The education sector is a vital arena that drives national progress and development by producing high-quality outcomes. This study's importance lies in its focus on one of the most pressing issues confronting public universities: workplace incivility. Such incivility negatively affects the job performance expected from university employees. By offering strategies and recommendations to mitigate this problem, the current research aims at enhancing employees' job performance in public universities, thereby contributing valuable insights and knowledge to the field.

We will present an overview of workplace incivility, followed by an exploration of its effects on job performance and employee well-being, including emotional states, cognitive distractions, and various physical and psychological health issues.

2.1. Definition and Forms of Workplace Incivility

Incivility refers to rude or disrespectful behaviors. Workplace incivility specifically encompasses negative behaviors by individuals in power or administrative roles directed towards employees, including injustice, bullying, and discrimination, which negatively affect performance (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). It can manifest at all levels, from university presidents to department heads, and includes threats, harassment, or repeated abuse. It is a broader concept than interactive injustice, which focuses on unfairness or insensitivity during policy implementation by authority figures. Incivility can emanate from leaders or peers and involves displays of ignorance or insensitivity.

Workplace incivility takes multiple forms, such as systematic ridicule, social exclusion, and mistreatment (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This issue is not new but is currently rising, particularly in developing countries. Such behaviors, often an abuse of power or unjust punishment, can erode self-confidence and hamper job performance. Incivility may escalate to verbal or nonverbal hostility, including antagonistic interactions, personal attacks, and social ostracism. Key features of workplace incivility include frequent repetition of hostile practices (e.g., verbal abuse, public humiliation, workflow obstruction), escalation from subtle derogatory language to overt offensive remarks and harsh criticism, and a power differential between perpetrators and targets (Whether a higher authority or a peer). It can also manifest intermittently over extended periods. Forms of incivility range from minor physical force to serious assault, verbal aggression (Insults, name-calling, harassment), and sexual harassment (Physical and verbal). Perpetrators may spread rumors, seize or damage property, steal work, or deny entitlements like leave, bonuses, or promotions.

Workplace incivility can be classified into two main types:

- Work-related incivility: Deliberate negative behaviors aimed at stripping the work environment of security and stability, ultimately discouraging employees and adversely affecting their performance (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Schilpzand et al., 2016).
- Person-related incivility: Behaviors that create a negative psychological impact on employees, manifesting as insomnia, anxiety, or depression, sometimes leading individuals to quit their jobs due to humiliation, rumors, or neglect (Cortina et al., 2001).

Reasons for workplace incivility include a perpetrator's sense of self-importance, possibly motivated by narcissism or a desire to impose respect (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011; Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011). It may also arise from an abuse of delegated authority (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003; Tepper, 2000) or be embedded in the organizational culture of the work environment (Einarsen et al., 2011; Salin, 2003).

2.2. The Dynamics of Incivility's Perpetrators and Targets: Implications for Job Performance and Employee Well-Being

Job performance encompasses the outcomes achieved by employees in public universities through their efforts to fulfill assigned duties effectively and efficiently, including knowledge, quantity, and quality of work, persistence, enthusiasm, self-improvement, and attention to the work environment. Intense competition among public universities places significant emphasis on employee job performance due to its impact on educational outcomes. However, exposure to workplace incivility is hypothesized to impair job performance by inducing negative emotional states, cognitive distractions, and fear among employees. These adverse effects extend beyond performance, affecting employees' psychological well-being and physical health. Research on daily hassles supports similar perspectives on individual harm. Empirical studies consistently identify numerous adverse work-related outcomes for targets of

unfair, harassing, verbally abusive, or psychologically aggressive workplace behaviors, including lower satisfaction with jobs, supervisors, and coworkers, reduced overall job satisfaction, and heightened absenteeism. Psychological conditions such as stress and anxiety are detrimental to universities through declines in performance, productivity, job engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Several studies have established correlations between workplace harassment and psychological well-being. Increased psychological complaints and links to post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and depression have been documented among targets of workplace incivility (Holm, Torkelson, & Bäckström, 2022; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018; Sansone & Sansone, 2015).

The specific characteristics of instigators and encouragers of incivility remain largely undefined. Drawing on Social Power Theory (French & Raven, 1959) interpersonal mistreatment may be facilitated by access to coercive, reward, and legitimate power bases. Gendered status hierarchies within organizations further influence perceptions of authority and influence, as men are often socially positioned as higher-status actors with broader access to structural power (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ridgeway, 2001). Such asymmetries may increase the likelihood that power is exercised in ways that enable or normalize incivility; within organizations, individuals with significant social and organizational resources may be more inclined to misuse their power. Studies indicate that superiors are more frequently identified as perpetrators of workplace abuse (57.8%) compared to coworkers (37.7%) and subordinates (5.0%) (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994). Zapf et al. (2020) carried out an analysis based on 80 samples of bullying victims. Weighted percentages with regard to sample size showed that 65.8% of victims were women and 34.2% men. Similarly, Cortina et al. (2002) found that 65% of women compared to 47% of men experienced "general incivility" at work. In academic setting, Björkqvist, Österman, and Hjelt-Bäck (1994) reported that 55% of female compared to 30% of male university employees experienced harassment at work. Other studies (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013; Pearson & Porath, 2009) further support that workplace incivility is particularly salient across gender lines, with women experiencing more incivility. Building on these findings, the following hypothesis is formulated.

Hypothesis 1: Holding more powerful positions within universities, as well as being male, is positively correlated with inciting workplace incivility.

Building on Barling (1996), which theorized the cumulative psychological impact of workplace aggression, more recent reviews (Barling, Dupré, & Kelloway, 2009) reaffirm that aggression, including low-level acts like incivility, can have profound implications for victims, particularly when perceived as unjust or power-driven. These findings support our second hypothesis, which draws on social power theory to examine how status, age, and gender may influence both perpetration and experience of incivility. Furthermore, younger employees engage in harassment more frequently than older colleagues, though the opposite pattern has been observed for experiences of incivility. Empirical research has produced mixed results on the causes and motives of interpersonal incivility, leading to reliance on social power theory for the second hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Holding lower-power positions within the organization, working in groups where one's gender is numerically in the minority, being female, belonging to a racial or tribal minority, being younger, or lacking support is associated with more frequent experiences of workplace mistreatment.

Stress-related health issues, such as heart disease, migraines, and ulcers, are linked to decreased employee productivity, including absenteeism, time manipulation, and early retirement. Universities are responsible for identifying theoretical and empirical considerations affecting employees' mental and physical health.

Hypothesis 3: Personal experiences in the workplace will be associated with adverse job-related, psychological, and physical outcomes.

A comprehensive understanding of workplace incivility must consider its victims or targets. Social power theory suggests that some manifestations of incivility serve as a means of asserting power. Society grants specific individuals greater power through social expectations, norms, and access to resources, making employees who lack these resources more vulnerable. In organizational contexts, employees with lower social power are more likely to

71

experience mistreatment. Obvious bases of power include hierarchical position and gender, where women often possess lower social, cultural, and physical power. Few empirical studies provide data on power-related characteristics of targets of uncivil behavior. While some research indicates men are more frequently hired for faculty positions than women in universities, other studies show similar rates of physical abuse and workplace bullying reported by both men and women.

This study offers deeper insight into different forms of workplace incivility, addressing limitations of previous studies, such as partial overlap among examined constructs (e.g., bullying, injustice, harassment) and varying definitions, measurement tools, and time frames leading to variations in reported rates of aggression. Given that most experimental research on incivility has been conducted in Western countries, and Jordan differs in occupational mental health laws, psychological standards, and cultural norms, findings from those nations cannot be directly generalized to Jordanian public universities (Schilpzand et al., 2016).

3. METHODOLOGY

The current study adopts a descriptive-analytical survey approach. Descriptive methods were used to detail the study topic, and analytical methods were employed to examine the data gathered via research instruments. The target population consists of all ten Jordanian public universities. A purposive sample was drawn from four universities in central Jordan: the University of Jordan, the German-Jordanian University, Al-Balqa Applied University, and the Hashemite University, resulting in 300 administrative employees. A questionnaire was developed and administered to this sample, capturing respondents' job-related and demographic characteristics, including age, gender, years of experience, and functional role.

3.1. Data Collection Instrument

A questionnaire was developed, consisting of 32 items divided into three parts.

1. Demographic and occupational variables: Captured respondents' characteristics, including age, gender, years of experience, and functional role (see Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of the target population.

Characteristics	Category	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	200	75%
	Female	100	31%
	Total	300	100%
Age	Under 30 years	9	3.70%
	30 to under 40 years	100	34.00%
	40 to under 45 years	120	39.40%
	46 years or above	71	25.50%
	Total	300	100%
Years of experience	Less than 5 years	46	5.70%
	5 to 10 years	190	65.30%
	11 to under 20 years	50	5.20%
	20 years or above	14	29.30%
	Total	300	100%
Grade	Employee	150	52.10%
	Section Head	40	14.60%
	Department Head	85	33.30%
	Division Head	25	7.60%
	Total	300	100%

The participants in this study included 200 males (67%) and 100 females (33%). Their age distribution shows that 3.7% were under 30 years, 34.0% were between 30 and 40 years, 39.4% were between 40 and 45 years, and 25.5% were 46 years or above.

In terms of years of experience, 5.7% had less than 5 years, 65.3% had between 5 and 10 years, 5.2% had between 11 and 20 years, and 29.3% had 20 years or more. Regarding their functional role or grade, employees constituted 52.1%, Section Heads 14.6%, Department Heads 33.3%, and Division Heads 7.6%.

2. Workplace Incivility Dimensions: Measured *via* the following 16 items. Respondents experiencing incivility were asked about the single incident that shaped their impression, focusing on the instigator's characteristics (Gender, position) (Table 2).

3. Job Performance Dimensions: Measured *via* 16 items (Table 3). The instrument utilized a five-point Likert scale (Strongly agree (5) to disagree (1)) for positively worded items. The original response format for questionnaires was standardized to a five-point scale, with options ranging from 0 to 4 ("Never" through "most of the time") or 1 to 3 ("No," "undecided," "yes"), and 1 to 5 ("Strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"). For the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), scores of 0 to 3 were recorded (0 = "no," 1 = "Undecided," 3 = "yes"). All items were coded such that higher scores indicated elevated levels of the underlying construct.

3.2. Instrument Validity and Reliability

Content validity was established using face validity. A panel of academic and professional experts reviewed the questionnaire for appropriateness, comprehensiveness, clarity, and grammatical accuracy, recommending modifications. Approximately 80% of their suggestions were incorporated, and linguistic clarity was improved before finalization.

The Reliability is confirmed using two methods:

1. Test-Retest Method: The instrument was administered to 20 individuals from the study population not included in the main sample, then readministered two weeks later. Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed between the two sets of scores.

2. Internal Consistency Method (Cronbach's Alpha): Cronbach's alpha yielded a coefficient of 0.85, indicating a high level of internal consistency.

3.3. Measurement and Control Variables

The study prioritized psychometric accuracy, focusing on measures designed to capture the effects of workplace incivility. The survey covered demographic and job-related characteristics, employees' psychological and physical conditions, and their experiences with uncivil incidents. Several sets of items were developed to assess different themes:

- Workplace Incivility

A questionnaire was designed to gauge the degree of incivility by examining interactions in the workplace. It measured how frequently respondents encountered behaviors they perceived as offensive, rude, or condescending, whether from supervisors, coworkers, or subordinates, over the past five years. The complete list of items appears in Table 2.

Note that the intent to harm the employee on the part of a supervisor or colleague may not always be immediately evident in most of these scenarios.

- Job-Related Outcomes

A separate questionnaire assessed job satisfaction, providing a descriptive index of satisfaction across five job facets: the nature of the work itself, coworkers, superiors, compensation and benefits, and promotional opportunities (Table 3).

Table 2. Workplace incivility questionnaire.

No.	Item
1	My direct supervisor or manager withholds information that affects my work.
2	My suggestions, opinions, and viewpoints are ignored.
3	I am assigned impossible tasks and asked to complete them under unrealistic deadlines.
4	Supervision focuses on finding faults rather than providing guidance and evaluation.
5	Continuous work pressure is used to deter employees from claiming their rights (e.g., sick leave, bonuses, etc.).
6	Verbal and moral abuse cannot be tolerated.
7	I engage in workplace bullying.
8	I assign tasks to others that do not match their skills or experience.
9	I assign undesirable employees to trivial, non-essential tasks.
10	I spread rumors that harm employees' reputation and performance.
11	I forgot to include others on the team.
12	I issue explicit and implicit threats (e.g., pointing fingers, making insinuations) to compel an employee to transfer or quit altogether.
13	I focus on others' mistakes while ignoring their achievements.
14	I interrupt employees whose opinions differ from mine at work.
15	I behave rudely in emails.
16	I experienced physical assault.

Table 3. Job performance questionnaire.

No.	Item
1	I take on the easy tasks and leave the difficult ones to others.
2	I take others' contributions for granted.
3	I pass judgment on those who are different from me.
4	I belittle others' efforts.
5	I arrive late or leave meetings early without a valid reason.
6	I ignore invitations from my colleagues at work.
7	I set others up for failure.
8	I show little interest in others' opinions.
9	I evade blame when I have contributed to a mistake.
10	I do not listen to my colleagues.
11	I cut off a certain employee from the work team.
12	I exploit others.
13	I keep employees waiting unnecessarily.
14	I speak negatively about others.
15	I withhold or delay information from my colleagues.
16	I receive most of the credit for collaborative work.

A general measure of organizational withdrawal was also employed, covering both:

a) Withdrawing from work as a whole.

b) Seeking transfers to other positions within the same institution.

- Job Commitment: Survey items measured the extent to which incivility influenced employees' commitment to their jobs, irrespective of financial considerations.

- Control and Methodological Variables: Employees' perceptions of how personal workplace relationships affect individual job performance or evaluations were measured. Demographic variables (Gender, age, job grade, years of experience) and workplace stress were included as controls in statistical analyses.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents key findings and a discussion of the results of the study.

4.1. Incidence Rates and Perpetrator Characteristics

Analyses of incidence rates revealed that 71% of the 300 employees reported experiencing incivility in the workplace within the past five years, sometimes in conjunction with harassment incidents. Specifically, 39% faced

incivility once or twice, 25% experienced verbal harassment, and 6% frequently endured incivility. These incidents were described as separate from sexual harassment. Among the entire sample, 261 respondents indicated experiencing workplace incivility in the absence of sexual harassment. Statistically significant differences were found regarding the perpetrator.

- 50% of incidents were instigated solely by coworkers.
- 15% by department heads alone.
- 7% by unit heads alone.
- 1% by a combination of colleagues and department heads.
- 16% by heads of divisions within the university.
- 12% by individuals in various positions acting in concert.

Further analysis showed differences in the perpetrator's gender: 42% were male, 49% were female, and 9% involved male and female instigators.

4.2. Outcomes of Workplace Incivility

Multiple interviews were conducted to measure the effects of workplace incivility on 12 psychological, physical, and job-related outcome variables. Demographic factors were controlled by regressing each outcome variable on gender, age, job grade, and years of experience. Workplace stress was also integrated as a control.

- Work-Related Outcomes: Workplace incivility emerged as a significant predictor for the five components of job satisfaction, beyond demographic factors and occupational stress. Satisfaction consistently declined with increased exposure to incivility. The additional variance explained ranged from 3% for satisfaction with pay and benefits to 16% for satisfaction with supervisors. More frequent incivility experiences contributed to an 8% increase in job withdrawal. While adding incivility to the overall work withdrawal model was statistically significant, it explained only a 1% increase in variance.
- Psychological and Physical Outcomes: Including workplace incivility improved the psychological distress model by explaining an additional 2% of the variance. As personal encounters with incivility became more common, employees exhibited higher levels of general psychological distress (e.g., depressive and anxiety symptoms). Accounting for gender significantly improved predictions, as both men and women experienced heightened distress with increasing mistreatment, but this effect was more pronounced among men. For psychological well-being, life satisfaction, and health satisfaction, adding workplace incivility and related interactions did not substantially enhance predictive accuracy.
- Control Variable: The study examined the effect of workplace incivility on external commitment to check for response-style bias. A model containing only demographic variables accounted for a substantial portion of the variance in external commitment, and the addition of occupational stress and mistreatment did not further improve this model.

4.3. Overall Levels of Incivility and Job Performance: Work-Related Incivility

The main findings related to levels of incivility and job performance in work-related incivility are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 illustrates the overall level of workplace incivility, which was registered at a moderate degree, with a mean score of 2.53. Item 2 ranked highest, showing a mean score of 3.20 and a standard deviation of 0.870 (also classified as moderate). In contrast, Item 1 ranked lowest among the assessed items. This suggests that employees often experience or perceive their contributions as being dismissed, which can negatively impact their engagement and morale. Conversely, the lowest-rated item relating to supervisors withholding information affecting work has a mean score of 2.00, indicating that this form of incivility is less frequently perceived or experienced by respondents.

These results imply that while incivility is not pervasive, certain behaviors, particularly being ignored or disregarded, are relatively common and noteworthy in the workplace environment.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for the work-related incivility dimension.

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Grade
1	My direct supervisor or manager withholds information that affects my work.	2.00	0.950	Low
2	My suggestions, opinions, and viewpoints are ignored.	3.20	0.870	Medium
3	I am assigned impossible tasks and asked to complete them under unrealistic deadlines.	2.32	1.053	Low
4	Supervision focuses on finding faults rather than providing guidance and evaluation.	3.00	0.920	Medium
5	Continuous work pressure is used to deter employees from claiming their rights (e.g., sick leave, bonuses, etc)	2.29	1.012	Low
6	Verbal and moral abuse cannot be tolerated.	2.35	0.884	Low
	Overall Mean	2.53		Medium

Table 5. Means and standard deviations for the person-related incivility dimension.

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Grade
7	I engage in workplace bullying.	2.33	0.875	Low
8	I assign tasks to others that do not match their skills or experience.	2.12	0.961	Low
9	I assign undesirable employees to trivial, non-essential tasks.	2.70	0.748	Medium
10	I spread rumors that harm employees' reputation and performance.	2.29	0.827	Low
11	I forgot to include others on the team.	2.50	1.061	Medium
12	I issue explicit and implicit threats (e.g., pointing fingers, making insinuations) to compel an employee to transfer or quit altogether.	1.99	0.759	Low
13	I focus on others' mistakes while ignoring their achievements.	2.10	0.794	Low
14	I interrupt employees whose opinions differ from mine at work.	2.26	0.916	Low
15	I behave rudely in emails.	1.70	0.649	Low
16	I experienced physical assault.	1.69	1.005	Low
	Overall Mean	2.17		Low

Table 5 shows that the overall degree of person-related incivility was low, with a mean score of 2.17. Item 9 ("I assign undesirable employees to trivial, non-essential tasks") ranked highest with a mean of 2.70, whereas Item 16 ("I experience physical assault") ranked last.

This suggests that some marginalizing actions occur but are not widespread. The lowest-rated item experiencing physical assault has a mean of 1.69, indicating that physical violence or assault is rare in the context of person-related incivility in this setting. Compared to workplace incivility in general, person-related incivility is relatively low among employees, though certain subtle forms, like assigning trivial tasks, are somewhat more prevalent.

Table 6. Means and standard deviations for the job performance dimension.

No.	Item	Mean	SD	Grade
17	I take on the easy tasks and leave the difficult ones to others.	4.30	0.940	High
18	I take others' contributions for granted.	3.90	0.836	High
19	I pass judgment on those who are different from me.	4.07	0.841	High
20	I belittle others' efforts.	3.68	0.920	High
21	I arrive late or leave meetings early without a valid reason.	4.10	0.749	High
22	I ignore invitations from my colleagues at work.	3.80	1.004	High
23	I set others up for failure.	3.40	0.852	Medium
24	I show little interest in others' opinions.	3.51	1.070	Medium
25	I evade blame when I have contributed to a mistake.	4.18	0.773	High
26	I do not listen to my colleagues.	4.06	0.810	High
27	I cut off a certain employee from the work team.	3.98	0.993	High
28	I exploit others.	2.98	1.249	Medium
29	I keep employees waiting unnecessarily.	3.43	1.029	Medium
30	I speak negatively about others.	3.86	0.999	High
31	I withhold or delay information from my colleagues.	4.23	0.692	Medium
32	I receive most of the credit for collaborative work.	3.25	1.012	Medium
	Overall Mean	3.80		High

Table 6 indicates that employees perceive their job performance as high, with a mean score of 3.80, suggesting generally positive self-assessment or perception of their work behaviors. The item most associated with this high rating is "I take on the easy tasks and leave the difficult ones to others," which has a notably high mean of 4.30; it reflects a tendency among employees to prefer more manageable tasks, which can possibly indicate a lack of engagement with challenging responsibilities. Conversely, "I exploit others" has the lowest mean of 2.98. This result suggests that exploitative behaviors are relatively uncommon in this context. These findings reveal that employees generally view their job performance favorably, with certain behaviors, such as avoiding complex tasks, being more prevalent than others, like exploitation of colleagues.

4.4. Hypothesis Testing

Diagnostic tests, including multicollinearity, variance inflation factor (VIF), and tolerance tests, confirmed the absence of high correlations among study variables. VIF values were below 10, tolerance values below 1, and skewness values ranged around 1.1, suggesting a normal data distribution (Table 7).

Table 7. Results of skewness, tolerance, and VIF tests.

Independent variables	VIF	Tolerance	Skewness
Work-related incivility	4.59	0.447	8.20
Person-related incivility	5.60	0.310	0.250

The null hypothesis "There is no statistically significant effect at $\alpha \leq 0.05$ of workplace incivility (work-related incivility and person-related incivility) on the job performance of employees in public universities" was tested using multiple linear regression analysis (Table 8).

Table 8. Results of multiple linear regression analysis for the effect of workplace incivility on job performance.

Model	β	Beta	t-value	P-value
Work-related incivility	-0.641	-0.420	-3.972	0.000*
Person-related incivility	-0.548	-0.372	-4.853	0.000*
R²	0.493			
F	33.107			
P-value	0.000			

Note: (*): The result is statistically significant at the 5% level.

The correlation coefficient was -0.493, indicating that workplace incivility explains approximately 49.3% of the variance in job performance. The calculated F-value was 33.107, and the p-value was 0.000. The results reveal that:

- Work-related incivility had a substantial impact on job performance (β = -0.641, T = -3.972, p ≤ 0.05).
- Person-related incivility also had a statistically significant effect (β = -0.548, T = -4.853, p ≤ 0.05).

Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis "There is a statistically significant effect at $\alpha \leq 0.05$ of workplace incivility (work-related and person-related) on the job performance of employees in public universities" was accepted.

4.5. Discussion

This study expands on previous research by including non-physical, non-specific, and intangible forms of incivility that are often overlooked. Consistent with Andersson and Pearson's (1999) theories on daily hassles, this research documents a range of negative consequences from everyday abusive incidents. Findings indicate that incivility is prevalent in Jordanian public universities, with over two-thirds of employees reporting disrespect, intolerance, social exclusion, and related behaviors. Female employees reported higher frequencies of incivility than male employees, suggesting incivility may be gender-specific in its targets, creating a disparate work environment.

While overall workplace incivility received a moderate relative importance rating, person-related incivility was rated low, and job performance garnered a high relative importance score. The statistically significant effect of workplace incivility on job performance was confirmed, with work-related incivility exerting a more significant impact than person-related incivility. This highlights the serious nature of workplace incivility, which universities should address to mitigate negative consequences on both the work environment and employee performance.

Some employees reported lower levels of incivility, likely due to their positions and privileges. This suggests employees in "ordinary" positions might be more targeted by colleagues' uncivil comments. These findings partially contradict the prediction that incivility disproportionately affects individuals at the bottom of the formal organizational hierarchy but confirm that status influences vulnerability. Contrary to the second prediction, higher-level administrators were a relatively small percentage of incivility instigators; most perpetrators were coworkers. This may be attributed to the numerical reality that line staff far outnumber department or administrative heads. Although the study could not precisely determine the total number of instigators due to potential overlap, patterns support the idea that individuals with greater power may be more inclined to behave uncivilly.

This study extends existing research by investigating three categories of outcomes (psychological, physical, and job-related), providing a clearer picture of the substantial negative repercussions of incivility on employees and universities. These findings align with research on daily hassles, which can overshadow major life stressors in predicting diminished social functioning, reduced job performance, and psychological harm. The results underscore the need to take workplace incivility seriously, echoing previous findings on the recurring impact of uncivil acts. The study also presents new evidence on the relationship between work-related and person-related incivility, indicating that uncivil behavior can heighten emotional and physical distress, with consequences more pronounced within the immediate work setting (work-related incivility).

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Workplace incivility, violating mutual respect rules, negatively impacts employees and universities by creating psychological stressors and individual harm. The high prevalence of incivility raises concerns about worsening negative interactions. This study examined the impact of workplace incivility on the job performance of employees in Jordanian public universities. The findings directly addressed the research question and hypotheses.

- First, the study confirmed a significant negative relationship between workplace incivility and job performance. Work-related and person-related incivility reduced employee effectiveness, with work-related incivility having a greater impact.

- Second, the expectation that individuals in more powerful positions and men are more likely to be perpetrators was partially unsupported. Most incidents of incivility originated from coworkers rather than superiors, and female perpetrators slightly outnumbered males.

- Third, the hypothesis that individuals with lower organizational power, minority status, or fewer support systems are more vulnerable to incivility was partially supported, especially concerning female employees and those in lower job grades.

- Finally, the study affirmed that workplace incivility is associated with adverse psychological, physical, and job-related outcomes, including lower job satisfaction, increased withdrawal behaviors, and greater emotional distress.

These results highlight that incivility is not merely a behavioral issue but a structural and organizational challenge that undermines both employee well-being and institutional performance.

To effectively mitigate workplace incivility in university contexts, leadership should prioritize the creation of a supportive organizational culture through comprehensive policies and programs. First, the HR department should establish clear, transparent, and equitable policies regarding promotions, workload distribution, and conflict resolution. Such policies will ensure that all employees understand the institution's expectations and have access to

fair procedures. This transparency will foster trust and accountability within the institution. Second, implementing regular training programs focused on interpersonal communication and conflict management can improve employees' capacity to manage and respond to uncivil behaviors proactively. Such training aligns with the study's emphasis on cultivating a safe and respectful climate. Additionally, promoting participatory leadership styles and decentralizing decision-making processes can empower employees, increase engagement, and foster a culture of mutual respect. Encouraging self-regulation and autonomy in work practices further supports a positive work environment. Furthermore, establishing confidential reporting mechanisms for incivility and ensuring prompt, fair responses will help address issues before they escalate, reinforcing organizational commitment to respectful interactions.

Future research should expand to other sectors and explore longitudinal and mixed-method designs to capture the evolving nature of workplace incivility. Collecting and analyzing data by gender, occupational role, and differential exposure to workplace incivility would offer more profound insights into how these factors intersect to influence job performance outcomes. Furthermore, attention should also be given to mediating variables such as emotional intelligence, leadership style, and organizational culture that may buffer or exacerbate the impact of incivility. Additionally, broader representation of non-traditional or remote work contexts will be essential for a more holistic understanding of this pervasive phenomenon.

By addressing workplace incivility through strategic, policy-level interventions and inclusive organizational practices, Jordanian public universities and similar institutions can enhance not only individual performance but also collective academic integrity and institutional effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202131

Baker, W. (2000). *Achieving success through social capital: Tapping the hidden resources in your personal and business networks.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, experience, and consequences of workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*(3), 123–135.

Barling, J., Dupré, K. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*(1), 671-692. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163629

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Bentley, T. A., Catley, B., Cooper-Thomas, H., Gardner, D., O'Driscoll, M. P., Dale, A., & Trenberth, L. (2012). Perceptions of workplace bullying in the New Zealand travel industry: Prevalence and management strategies. *Tourism Management, 33*(2), 351-360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.04.004

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional injustice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), Advances in organizational justice. In (pp. 89–118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, *20*(3), 173-184.

Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*(4), 268–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.007

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, *39*(6), 1579-1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835

Cortina, L. M., Lonsway, K. A., Magley, V. J., Freeman, L. V., Collinsworth, L. L., Hunter, M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). What's gender got to do with it? Incivility in the federal courts. *Law & Social Inquiry*, *27*(2), 235-270. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2002.tb00804.x

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*(1), 64-80. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

French, J. J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. In (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research

Holm, K., Torkelson, E., & Bäckström, M. (2022). Workplace incivility as a risk factor for workplace bullying and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study of targets and bystanders in a sample of swedish engineers. *BMC Psychology*, *10*(1), 299. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-022-00996-1

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education: Causes, consequences, and management. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *32*(1), 48-70. https://doi.org/10.2753/ATP1084-1806320103

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, *9*(4), 341–357. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.9.4.341

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, *110*(2), 265–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 910–925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.011

Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. V. (2018). What we know, what we do not know, and what we should and could have known about workplace bullying: An overview of the literature and agenda for future research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *42*, 71-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.06.007

Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior: How incivility ruins your business and what you can do about*. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.

Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(5), 1181-1197. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.20159919

Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 637-655. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00233

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, *56*(10), 1213–1232. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035610003

Sansone, R. A., & Sansone, L. A. (2015). Workplace bullying: A tale of adverse consequences. *Innovations in Clinical Neuroscience*, *12*(1-2), 32–37.

Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(S1), S57-S88. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1976

Shi, Y., Guo, H., Zhang, S., Xie, F., Wang, J., Sun, Z., . . . Fan, L. (2018). Impact of workplace incivility against new nurses on job burn-out: A cross-sectional study in China. *BMJ Open, 8*(4), e020461. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020461

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556375

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5*(2), 301-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585199400000020

Zapf, D., Escartín, J., Scheppa-Lahyani, M., Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2020). Empirical findings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Theory, research and practice. In (3rd ed., pp. 75–106). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press/Taylor & Francis